



**Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)**

**Monday, November 19, 2018**

COMM 109 - 2:30pm to 4:00pm

**ALC Co-Chairs/SLO Coordinators:** Russell Serr and Kevin Degnan

**Recorder:** Isabelle Peña

**Attendees:**

ECC Academic Affairs – Linda Clowers

Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young

Business – Brizset Giles

Health Sciences and Athletics – Russell Serr

Humanities – Mora Mattern & Maria Barrio de Mendoza

Industry & Technology – Merriel Winfree & Bruce Tran

Mathematical Sciences – Catherine Schult-Roman

Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes

Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe

**MINUTES**

**Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

- A. Russell S. moved to approve the minutes for the 10/08/2018 ALC meeting; Claudia S. seconded motion. Motion was carried.

**II. Reports**

**A. Fall 2018 Assessment Reports – Kevin Degnan**

1. Need to start entering Fall 2018 Assessment Reports.
2. There is a training workshop on December 5, 2018 from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Library Basement West. This is a working workshop where faculty actively enter their reports in Nuventive Improve.
3. SLO assessments are due on March 1, 2019. PLO assessments are due 2 weeks after, on March 15, 2019.
4. Some divisions received certificates for having 100% completion of their SLO assessments.

**B. Nuventive Improve 'Red Flags' – Isabelle Peña**

"Red Flags" have been changed to reflect Fall 2018 assessments. Facilitators are being asked to check Nuventive Improve and make sure that the Course SLOs marked as due for Fall 2018 assessment are accurate and to let Isabelle P. know if there are still SLOs showing for courses that were either cancelled or not offered.

**C. ALC/SLO-PLO Team Site – Isabelle Peña**

1. Isabelle created the ALC/SLO-PLO Team Site for Committee Members and SLO/PLO Facilitators. Current ALC members and Facilitators should have received an e-mail from Microsoft Teams stating "Isabelle added you to the ALC and SLO/PLO Staff Team"; members should then click on the link in the e-mail and log on to Microsoft Teams using their ECC e-mail. Members can also download the Microsoft Teams app on their smartphone, iPad, or tablet. It can also be downloaded on their desktop or can be accessed online by going to the Microsoft Teams website on their desktop and bookmark the site.

2. This team site can be used for discussion (under the *Conversation* tab) and to share files (under the *Files* tab). A “channel” has also been created for each ILO. These ILO “channels” are to be used for discussion outside of the ALC meeting, for ILOs that are being assessed.
3. Another “channel” called *SAO* will also be added to the Teams Site.
4. Under *Files* tab, there is a folder called *Forms*. This is where the SLO and PLO statement change forms are located and can be downloaded for use. (Please use the forms in this folder as they are the most current versions, i.e. all references to Compton have been removed.)
5. A tab called *Tasks* will also be added. Here, we can add tasks that can be assigned to certain people.

**D. New Course SLO Form – Isabelle Peña (Handout)**

1. A new form, the New Course SLO Form, has also been created and uploaded to the Teams Site. This form was created because Isabelle P. has received a few of SLO Statement Change forms that contained new SLO statements for new courses. This form is to be filled out when a new course is added to the curriculum and has been approved by the Curriculum Committee, the Board of Trustees, and the Chancellor’s Office. This form needs to be submitted and approved by the division dean, the Facilitator, and the SLO Coordinator in order to be added to Nuventive Improve.
2. Courses are expected to have a minimum of three (3) SLO statements. There is a section on the form to enter justification if the course has less three (3) statements.
  - a. Janet Y. asked what the Curriculum Committee should do if a new course has been submitted with less than three SLOs; Russell S. stated that the Curriculum Committee can approve the course and contact that area’s facilitator, who can then work with the faculty to craft the three SLOs or approve the justification if they have less than three.
3. This form, along with the SLO/PLO Statement Change forms, will also be uploaded to ECC’s SLO website.

**E. Communication ILO (#2) Rubric – Kevin Degnan & Russell Serr (Handout)**

1. Rubric to use for assessing this ILO was distributed at the meeting. This is the same rubric we used four years ago; a lot has been done to develop this rubric when it was first developed.
2. Three (3) major areas: Organization, Delivery, and Substantive Content.  
Five scores: 1/Poor, 2/Below Average, 3/Satisfactory, 4/Above Average, and 5/Excellent.
3. The results were good four years ago, but the sample size was small.
4. We plan to give this rubric to faculty early. After the first drop date, Josh R. (IRP) can get the rosters and shortly after that, we can identify and select the faculty that can participate in the assessment.
5. We will emphasize to the faculty that they do not have to create a special assignment for this assessment; that they use something that they already have.

**F. Faculty Survey – Kevin Degnan & Russell Serr (Handout)**

1. Continuing discussion of this topic. We would like to know how aware faculty are of the assessment process, how aware they are of who and what their resources are for SLO/PLO assessment, and how they feel about the whole process.
2. Coordinators came up with 13 questions, but thinking about scaling it down to 10. ALC agreed that 10 questions should be enough for the survey.
3. Questions 12 and 13: Russell S. thinks that a lot of faculty are not aware of the college’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and their course alignment with ILOs.
4. Can include open-ended questions; for example, “How do we improve the SLO process?” or “How do we make the SLO process more meaningful?” or “How do you share results with other faculty or are you sharing results with faculty?”
5. We will be using Qualtrix (survey application) for this survey. Russell S. will create the survey during the Winter Intersession.

6. Russell S. suggested that we should wait until after the Fall 2018 assessments are due to bring the final copy of the survey to the ALC, most likely at the first ALC meeting in Spring 2019.
7. ALC agreed that a separate survey should be created for SAO survey. If we include SAO questions in the SLO survey, it can confuse people.
  - a. We can tweak the SLO questions to be more SAO-specific. Kevin D. will work on this and forward to Claudia S. for review.
  - b. For Question 1, Claudia S. recommended adding “Bi-Weekly” as one of the choices since they meet bi-weekly.
  - c. Russell S. asked who would be the target group for SAO survey. Linda C. stated this would be a question for Robin Dreizler since there has not been as much consistency across the student service areas as there has been in the academic divisions.

### III. Other Items

#### A. Follow-Ups

Russell S. asked the ALC if anyone has had any success with faculty completing follow-ups. The answer was that it is tough to get faculty to do them. Isabelle P. will update the Action & Follow-Up ad hoc report to include “Faculty Assessment Leader” instead of “Action Assigned To”.

#### B. Information Literacy ILO (#4) Assessment SAILS Survey

SAILS Survey Report is going through final proofreading and editing process. We will be providing this at the first ALC meeting in Spring 2019.

### IV. Next meeting – March 11, 2019

V. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

<b>Spring 2019 ALC Meetings</b> Mondays, 2:30 - 4:00 pm COMM 109	<b>Facilitator Training Sessions</b> Tuesdays 1:00 - 2:00 pm COMM 109	<b>TracDat “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in Nuventive</b> Library Basement West	<b>Deadlines</b>
March 11 April 15 May 13	March 12 April 16 May 14	February 27, 2019 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm	Fall 2018 <b>SLO</b> Assessments Due Date: March 1, 2019  Fall 2018 <b>PLO</b> Assessments Due Date: March 22, 2019



**Appendix A: Synoptic Communication Rubric: Assessment of ILO #2 – Spring 2015**  
**Standard: 3 or higher in all areas is considered successful**

Communication Trait	1 Poor	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
<b>Organization</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thesis/purpose</li> <li>• Flow of ideas</li> <li>• Intro/body/conclusion</li> <li>• Artistic composition</li> <li>• Grammatical structure/linguistics</li> </ul>	<b>Not executed;</b> does not have clear structure or organization	<b>Somewhat executed;</b> some portions have clear structure and organization	<b>Mostly executed;</b> most portions have clear structure and organization	<b>Majorly executed;</b> majority of portions have clear structure and organization	<b>Fully executed;</b> all portions have clear structure and organization
<b>Delivery</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verbal, Syntax</li> <li>• Non-verbal</li> <li>• Shows awareness of audience</li> <li>• Technical skill</li> <li>• Phonology, correct pronunciation, non-manual signs, parameter</li> </ul>	<b>Not executed;</b> does not use appropriate syntax, technique, non-verbal cues, etc...	<b>Somewhat executed;</b> some use of appropriate syntax, technique, non-verbal cues, etc...	<b>Mostly executed;</b> mostly used appropriate syntax, technique, non-verbal cues, etc...	<b>Majorly executed;</b> majority use of appropriate syntax, technique, non-verbal cues, etc...	<b>Fully executed;</b> full use of appropriate syntax, technique, non-verbal cues, etc... throughout
<b>Substantive Content</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate and appropriate data</li> <li>• Research/support/ evidence</li> <li>• Accuracy of content</li> <li>• Artistic creativity/ originality</li> <li>• Lexicon, vocabulary</li> </ul>	<b>Not executed;</b> does not demonstrate sufficient research, sound data, or original thought	<b>Somewhat executed;</b> Some demonstration of sufficient research, sound data, or original thought	<b>Mostly executed;</b> mostly demonstrated sufficient research, sound data, or original thought	<b>Majorly executed;</b> majority demonstration of sufficient research, sound data, or original thought	<b>Fully executed;</b> full demonstration of sufficient research, sound data, or original thought throughout



# Possible Questions for Faculty Involvement in Outcomes Assessment Process

- 1) How often do you communicate with your division's SLO Facilitator(s) in an average semester?
  - a. Weekly
  - b. Monthly
  - c. 2-3 times per semester
  - d. Once per semester
  - e. Never
- 2) Have you used SLO results or action items to ask for support or funding in Program Review?  
Y/N
- 3) How often have you used SLO results or action items to ask for support or funding in Program Review?
  - a. Once
  - b. Twice
  - c. More than twice
  - d. Never
- 4) In the last 4 years, how often have you contributed data and analysis to an SLO assessment?
  - a. Once
  - b. Twice
  - c. 3-4 times
  - d. More than 4 times
  - e. Never
- 5) In the last 4 years, how often have you been the lead faculty for an SLO assessment and been responsible for writing the main report that is entered in Nuventive/Tracdat?
  - a. Once
  - b. Twice
  - c. 3-4 times
  - d. More than 4 times
  - e. Never
- 6) In the last 4 years, how often have you made changes in your teaching methods as a result of your awareness of the results of a course SLO assessment?
  - a. Never
  - b. Once or twice
  - c. 2-3 times
  - d. 4 times or more
- 7) SLO assessments results are reflective of real student learning.
  - a. Strongly disagree
  - b. Disagree
  - c. Neutral
  - d. Agree
  - e. Strongly agree

- 8) The actions proposed in SLO reports for the courses I am involved in are implemented and followed-up on.
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
  - I'm not sure
- 9) The assessments my department and division uses to gather SLO data are meaningful and appropriate.
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
- 10) I am aware of the Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessment my department has conducted in the last 4 years and the results of those assessments.
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
- 11) Improvements have been made in my courses' curriculum, teaching methods, or in improved resources from the college as a result of Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessments.
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
  - I am unaware of any changes made as a result of PLO assessments
- 12) I am aware of how the courses I teach align with the college's Institution Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree
- 13) I am aware of how the courses I teach align with my division's Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and how the courses and PLOs align with the college's Institution Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
- Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree